



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,138	09/30/2003	Risto Olavi Harjula	7212.3001.002	5711
7590	08/11/2006		EXAMINER	
William J. Schramm Reising Ethington, Barnes, Kisselle, P.C. P.O. Box 4390 Troy, MI 48099			CINTINS, IVARS C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1724	

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding:

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/675,138	HARJULA ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Ivars C. Cintins	1724

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 26 July 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on 22 June 2006. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
 5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
 6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
 7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 2-4, 7, 9, 10 and 17-22.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
 9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
 10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_  
 12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
 13.  Other: See attached supplement.

Supplement to Advisory Action

The amendment filed July 26, 2006 has been entered, but does not overcome the rejections contained in the Office action dated January 25, 2006.

Applicant argues that titanium must always be present in the material of the '243 patent (i.e. Bedard), and that germanium (Ge) may also be present in this reference material, whereas the current claims do not include the presence of measurable and significant amounts of titanium or Ge. Accordingly, since Applicant contends that the additional materials in the prior art are excluded by the recitation of "consisting essentially of," Applicant has the burden of showing that the introduction of these additional components would materially change the characteristics of Applicant's invention. *In re De Lajarte*, 337 F.2d 870, 143 USPQ 256 (CCPA 1964). See also *Ex parte Hoffman*, 12 USPQ2d 1061, 1063-64 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989). Absent such a showing, "consisting essentially of" will be construed as equivalent to "comprising" (PPG, 156 F.3d at 1355, 48 USPQ2d at 1355). See M.P.E.P. § 2111.03. Since Applicant has not provided the above noted showing, the term "consisting essentially of," recited in claims 17 and 22, has been has been construed as equivalent to comprising.

The Declaration by Dr. Minihan, filed July 26, 2006, has been noted and carefully considered but is not deemed to be persuasive for the following reasons. The data presented in this declaration appears to compare tungsten doped antimony silicates against titanium doped antimony silicates for the removal of cesium (Cs), strontium (Sr) and cobalt (Co) from nitric acid solutions. However, this declaration does not appear to

compare antimony silicates doped only with tungsten against antimony silicates doped with both tungsten and titanium; and therefore, this declaration does not show that the presence of titanium in the recited material would materially change the characteristics of Applicant's invention. Accordingly, the "consisting essentially of" language recited in claims 17 and 22 is still being construed as equivalent to comprising. See M.P.E.P. § 2111.03.

Furthermore, since the claims in this application are not limited to tungsten doped antimony silicates (i.e. the antimony silicate could be doped with niobium and/or tantalum), nor are they limited to the removal of cesium, strontium or cobalt from nitric acid solutions, the results presented in this declaration are not commensurate in scope with the claims in this application; and therefore, these results do not show that the presence of titanium in the recited material would materially change the characteristics of Applicant's claimed invention, nor do they show new and unexpected results for the claimed subject matter.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to I. Cintins whose telephone number is 571-272-1155. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Duane Smith, can be reached at 571-272-1166.

The centralized facsimile number for the USPTO is **571-273-8300**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



**Ivars C. Cintins**  
**Primary Examiner**  
**Art Unit 1724**

I. Cintins  
August 10, 2006